



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,844	08/21/2003	Chun-Liang Lee	LEEC 3071/BEU/LCD	6149
23364 7590 11/27/2007 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER TRAN, PHILIP B	
			ART UNIT 2155	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/644,844	Applicant(s) LEE, CHUN-LIANG	
	Examiner Philip B. Tran	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Request for Consideration

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to Remarks filed 17 September 2007. Claims 1-4 are pending for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbondanzio et al (Hereafter, Abbondanzio), U.S. Pat. No. 6,968,414.

Regarding claim 1, Abbondanzio teaches a method of remotely monitoring one of a plurality of blade servers in a rack, each of the blade servers being coupled to a network switch which is in turn coupled to a computer system in a console (= management system 120) which, when detecting one of the blade servers is to be replaced and as commanded by a management employee, performs the steps of reading an input instruction of tripping a latch used to fasten each of the blade servers to the rack from the management employee and sending the input instruction to the blade server via the network switch (= monitoring insertion and removal of server blades in a data processing system by determining the status of the latch) [see Abstract and Col. 4, Line 46 to Col. 6, Line 36].

Abbondanzio does not explicitly teach causing the blade server to trip the latch from the rack according to the input instruction. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to realize that ejecting mechanism of an object (such as remotely ejecting a disc) or turning on a LED indication can be implement in order to command for tripping the latch from the rack to quickly identify abnormal condition of a particular blade among a cluster of blade servers in the rack.

Regarding claims 2-3, Abbondanzio further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of the blade servers comprises an I2C (Inter-Integrated Circuit) bus including a GPIO (General Purpose Input and Output) for coupling to an external device, and a magnetic switch coupled to the I2C bus, the magnetic switch being adapted to control and trip the latch coupled to the blade server and further comprising a loop consisting of the computer system in the console, the network switch, and the GPIO of the I2C bus so that the computer system in the console can be coupled to the I2C bus by coupling a serial port of the network switch to the GPIO of the I2C bus for detecting and controlling the blade servers [see Figs. 1-3 and Col. 3, Line19 to Col. 4, Line 45].

Regarding claim 4, Abbondanzio does not explicitly teach wherein the input instruction is sent to the I2C bus and the magnetic switch via the network switch and the coupled serial port and the GPIO, and in response to reading the input instruction by the

magnetic switch, the magnetic switch causes the latch coupled to the blade server to trip as commanded by the input instruction. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to realize that ejecting mechanism of an object (such as remotely ejecting a disc) or turning on a LED indication can be implement in order to command for tripping the latch from the rack to quickly identify abnormal condition of a particular blade among a cluster of blade servers in the rack as set forth in claim 1.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Based on the reasonably broadest interpretation, Abbondanzio still teaches a method of remotely monitoring one of a plurality of blade servers in a rack, each of the blade servers being coupled to a network switch which is in turn coupled to a computer system in a console such as a management system 120 which, when detecting one of the blade servers is to be replaced and as commanded by a management employee, performs the steps of reading an input instruction of tripping a latch used to fasten each of the blade servers to the rack from the management employee and sending the input instruction to the blade server via the network switch. For example, Abbondanzio discloses monitoring insertion and removal of server blades in a data processing system by determining the status of the latch [see Abbondanzio, Abstract and Col. 4, Line 46 to Col. 6, Line 36].

Abbondanzio does not explicitly teach causing the blade server to trip the latch from the rack according to the input instruction. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to realize that ejecting mechanism of an object (such as remotely ejecting a disc) or turning on a LED indication can be implement in order to command for tripping the latch from the rack to quickly identify abnormal condition of a particular blade among a cluster of blade servers in the rack.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that the cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims. Dependent claims are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 1-4 are respectfully rejected as shown above.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CAR 1.136(A) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT, HOWEVER, WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3991. The Group fax phone number is (571) 273-8300. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on (571) 272-4006.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PHILIP TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2155
Nov 23, 2007